



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/053,375	10/25/2001	Todd Fischer	10012680-1	2870

7590 12/17/2004

HEWLETT-PACKARD COMPANY
Intellectual Property Administration
P.O. Box 272400
Fort Collins, CO 80527-2400

EXAMINER

HEWITT II, CALVIN L

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

3621

DATE MAILED: 12/17/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/053,375	FISCHER, TODD
	Examiner Calvin L Hewitt II	Art Unit 3621

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 20 September 2004.
- 2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1,2,4-13 and 15-19 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1,2,4-13 and 15-19 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.	5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
	6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____.

Status of Claims

1. Claims 1, 2, 4-13 and 15-19 have been examined.

Response to Argument/Amendment

2. The Applicant is of the opinion that the combined prior art does not teach a remote print system implemented by a printing device. The Examiner respectfully disagrees. Zingher teaches a print management system where a user computer and remote printing system exchange encrypted data transmissions over a computer network ('260, figure 1; column 3, lines 40-50). Specifically, Zingher teaches the user computer in connection over said network with a printing machine controller ('260, column 4, lines 58-67). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill to combine the teachings of Zingher and Maldy in order to exchange encrypted transmissions between the user computer and the printing machine controller ('406, column 1, lines 5-55; '260, column 3, lines 40-51). The Applicant's Disclosure states that the remote print system is preferably implemented by or otherwise associated with a printing device and can be implemented in software, firmware, hardware, or a combination thereof (Specification, page 6, lines 20-22). In the printing device

software implementation, Applicant describes a system analogous to the teachings of Zingher ('260, figure 2) where the remote printing system is a computer implemented as or associated with a printing device (Specification, page 7, lines 4-7). Therefore, the Examiner maintains the rejection to Applicant's claims.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 1-3, 11, 12, 14, 15, and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Zingher, U.S. Patent No. 5,897,260 in view of Maldy, U.S. Patent No. 5,956,406.

As per claims 1, 2, 11, 12, 15, and 18, Zingher teaches a print job allocation system comprising a remote print system (second location) for receiving and printing a customer (i.e. print request system or first location) print order (abstract; figure 1). Zingher also discloses communication with the remote print system over wireless networks (column 3, lines 25-40). As per claims 6 and 7, Zingher teaches that all communication between parties participating in the

print job allocation system can be encrypted (column 3, lines 40-51). Zingher teaches a computer (e.g. data retrieval/encryption system) (figure 1, item 30; column 4, lines 57-65) in communication with a remote print system over a network (figure 1) that locates and communicates information to the print system of said network (abstract; column 3, lines 25-40; column/line 4/66-5/15). Further, Zingher teaches a user connected to the internet, for example, through AOL (column 3, lines 35-40). (Claim 7) A well-known method for accessing information to be printed using a computer (i.e. data retrieval/encryption system) is via the internet. However, Zingher does not specifically recite a remote print system providing an encryption key to a computer over a communication network. Maldy teaches a system for providing secure communication between parties where users generate public/secret key pairs and provide the other party with the public key (e.g. encryption key). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill to combine the teachings of Zingher and Maldy in order to exchange confidential information between parties ('406, column 1, lines 5-55; '260, column 3, lines 40-51).

5. Claims 4, 5, 13, 16, and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Zingher, U.S. Patent No. 5,897,260 and Maldy, U.S. Patent No. 5,956,406 as applied to claims 3, 15 and 18 above, and in further view of Chomet, U.S. Patent No. 4,645,873.

As per claims 4, 5, 13, 16, 17 and 20, Zingher teaches a print job allocation system where communications between a print request system and a print system are encrypted (abstract; figure 1; column 3, lines 40-50). Maldy teaches setting up secure communications between two parties where one party sends an encryption key to another for encrypting information to be sent back to the first party (column 1, lines 20-47). However, neither Zingher nor Maldy teach displaying the key. Chomet teaches communications over an electronic network where, to facilitate secure communications between parties, a sender provides a receiver with sender's address and public key, which is displayed to the receiver (figure 4; column 3, lines 25-50) who in turn provides the key. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill to combine the teachings Zingher, Maldy and Chomet in order provide an efficient method for retrieving public keys ('873, column 3, lines 35-38)

6. Claims 8-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Zingher, U.S. Patent No. 5,897,260 in view of Maldy, U.S. Patent No. 5,956,406 and Barkan, U.S. Patent No. 5,864,667.

As per claims 8-10, Zingher teaches a print job allocation system where communications between a computer (e.g. print request system) and a print system are encrypted (abstract; figure 1; column 3, lines 40-50). Zingher teaches the computer receiving information (column 7, lines 38-55). Zingher also teaches

the print request system as a portable computing device as Zingher discloses communication with the remote print system over wireless networks (column 3, lines 25-40). Maldy teaches setting up secure communications between two parties where one party sends an encryption key to another for encrypting information to be sent back to the first party (column 1, lines 20-47). However, neither Zingher nor Maldy explicitly recite a computer communicating an encryption key and associated data to a retrieval/encryption system. Barkan teaches a computer coupled to an encryption machine (e.g. data retrieval/encryption system) (figures 1 and 2) each with their own user interface (column 5, lines 10-14 and 19-21) where the computer receives information (if it can receive a key the computer can configured to receive additional information and vice versa) and sends information to an encryption machine (e.g. data retrieval/encryption system) (column 5, lines 15-48). Regarding "wireless communication" (claim 10), Barkan teaches a computer connected to an encryption machine via a communication channel (figure 1, item 311). To one of ordinary skill, a well-known means for exchanging data between computers or computing devices is over a wireless channel. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill to combine the teachings of Zingher, Maldy and Barkan in order to receive a public key ('667, column 5, lines 35-43) of a public/private pair ('667, abstract; '406, abstract, column 1, lines 15-47) for

conducting secure communications ('260, column 3, lines 40-50) with the print plant ('260, figure 1).

Conclusion

7. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

8. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the Examiner should be directed to Calvin Loyd Hewitt II whose telephone number is (703) 308-8057. The Examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 8:30 AM-5:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the Examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the Examiner's supervisor, James P. Trammell, can be reached at (703) 305-9768.

Any response to this action should be mailed to:

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks
c/o Technology Center 2100
Washington, D.C. 20231

or faxed to:

(703) 305-7687 (for formal communications intended for entry and after-final communications),

or:

(703) 746-5532 (for informal or draft communications, please label "PROPOSED" or "DRAFT")

Hand-delivered responses should be brought to Crystal Park 5,
2451 Crystal Drive, 7th Floor Receptionist.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-1113.

Calvin Loyd Hewitt II

December 9, 2004

JAMES P. TRAMMELL
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TELEPHONE (703) 305-9768